UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,576	02/28/2002	Nischal Abrol	010462	9020

23696   7590   01/02/2008

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, TOAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/02/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com
kascanla@qualcomm.com
nanm@qualcomm.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/086,576	ABROL ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Toan D. Nguyen	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _10 October 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _5-7,15,17-20,26,33,36 and 38_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _5-7,15,17-20,26,33,36 and 38_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _28 February 2002_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3.   Claims 5, 26 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Shacher et al. (US 5,671,223) in view of Hwang (Us 6,788,652) further in view of

Aggarwal et al. (US 6,249,525).

For claim 5, Shacher et al. disclose multichannel HDLC framing/deframing

machine, comprising:

an input interface unit (figure 4, reference 120) operative to receive data to be

deframed (col. 7, lines 10-11);

a detection unit (figure 9, reference 308) operative to evaluate each data byte

from the input interface unit to detect for bytes of specific values (col. 11, line 65 to col.

12, line 1), the detection unit is operative to detect for flag bytes in the received data

(col. 11, line 67 to col. 12, line 1); and

a state control unit (figure 9, reference 312) operative to provide a first set of

control signals indicative of specific tasks to be performed for deframing based in part

on the detected bytes of specific values (col. 12, lines 27-57).

Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose a conversion unit operative to deframe

the received data based on the first set of control signals to provide deframed data. To

include conversion unit operative to deframe the received data based on the first set of

control signals to provide deframed data would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art because Shacher et al. clearly teach at col. 12 lines 40-49 (see FIG.10),

"The Rx Main Transfer Control circuit 312 determines whether or not the bits shifted out

of the PRE register 310 are shifted into the DATA register 330... Determination whether

the machine is Inframe is according to the state diagram in FIG.10. Zero deletion is

triggered when Inframe and five ones are detected (FONES) by the PST detection

circuit 322."

However, Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose one or more Radio Link

Protocol (RLP) packets, conversion unit being operative to remove flag and escape

bytes in the received data, and the detection unit is operative to detect for escape bytes

in the received data. In an analogous art, Hwang discloses one or more Radio Link

Protocol (RLP) packets (col. 6, lines 47-49).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the one or more Radio Link Protocol (RLP) packets, and would have applied Hwang's RLC in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Hwang's radio protocol for mobile communication system and method in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation being to provide the RLC-ACK entity 130 (col. 6, line 47).

Furthermore, Shacher et al. in view of Hwang do not expressly disclose the conversion unit being operative to remove flag and escape bytes in the received data, and the detection unit is operative to detect for escape bytes in the received data. In an analogous art, Aggarwal et al. disclose remove flag and escape bytes in the received data (col. 13 line 66 to col. 14 line 14), and the detection unit is operative to detect for escape bytes in the received data (col. 1, lines 43-44).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the remove flag and escape bytes in the received data, and would have applied Aggarwal et al.'s HDLC operation in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Aggarwal et al.'s method of and apparatus for inserting and/or deleting escape characters into and from data packets and datagrams therefor on high speed data stream networking lines in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation being compared with either 7d or 7e or some programmed ACCM characters (col. 14, lines 7-9).

For claim 26, Shacher et al. disclose multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine, comprising:

an input interface unit (figure 4, reference 120) operative to receive data to be deframed (col. 7, lines 10-11);

a detection unit (figure 9, reference 308) operative to evaluate each data byte from the input interface unit to detect for bytes of specific values (col. 11, line 65 to col. 12, line 1); and

a state control unit (figure 9, reference 312) operative to provide a first set of control signals indicative of specific tasks to be performed for deframing based in part on the detected bytes of specific values (col. 12, lines 27-57).

Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose a conversion unit operative to frame the received data based on the first set of control signals to provide framed data. To include conversion unit operative to frame the received data based on the first set of control signals to provide framed data would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because Shacher et al. clearly teach at col. 12 lines 40-49 (see FIG.10), "The Rx Main Transfer Control circuit 312 determines whether or not the bits shifted out of the PRE register 310 are shifted into the DATA register 330... Determination whether the machine is Inframe is according to the state diagram in FIG.10. Zero deletion is triggered when Inframe and five ones are detected (FONES) by the PST detection circuit 322."

However, Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose one or more Radio Link Protocol (RLP) packets, the conversion unit is operative to insert an escape bytes upon detection of a data byte having one of the specific values. In an analogous art, Hwang discloses one or more Radio Link Protocol (RLP) packets (col. 6, lines 47-49).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the one or more Radio Link Protocol (RLP) packets, and would have applied Hwang's RLC in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Hwang's radio protocol for mobile communication system and method in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation being to provide the RLC-ACK entity 130 (col. 6, line 47).

Furthermore, Shacher et al. in view of Hwang do not expressly disclose the conversion unit is operative to insert an escape byte upon detection of a data byte having one of the specific values. In an analogous art, Aggarwal et al. disclose the conversion unit is operative to insert an escape byte upon detection of a data byte having one of the specific values (col. 13, lines 66-67).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the conversion unit is operative to insert an escape byte upon detection of a data byte having one of the specific values, and would have applied Aggarwal et al.'s HDLC operation in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Aggarwal et al.'s method of and apparatus for inserting and/or deleting escape characters into and from data packets and datagrams therefor on high speed data stream networking lines in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation being compared with either 7d or 7e or some programmed ACCM characters (col. 14, lines 7-9).

For claim 33, Shacher et al. disclose multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine, comprising:

an input interface unit (figure 4, reference 120) operative to receive data to be

deframed in one or more packets (col. 7, lines 10-11);

a detection unit (figure 9, reference 308) operative to evaluate each data byte

from the input interface unit to detect for bytes of specific values (col. 11, line 65 to col.

12, line 1); and

a state control unit (figure 9, reference 312) operative to provide a first set of

control signals indicative of specific tasks to be performed for deframing based in part

on the detected bytes of specific values (col. 12, lines 27-57).

Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose a conversion unit operative to frame the

received data based on the first set of control signals to provide framed data. To include

conversion unit operative to frame the received data based on the first set of control

signals to provide framed data would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art because Shacher et al. clearly teach at col. 12, lines 40-49 (see FIG.10), "The Rx

Main Transfer Control circuit 312 determines whether or not the bits shifted out of the

PRE register 310 are shifted into the DATA register 330... Determination whether the

machine is Inframe is according to the state diagram in FIG.10. Zero deletion is

triggered when Inframe and five ones are detected (FONES) by the PST detection

circuit 322."

However, Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose one or more Radio Link

Protocol (RLP) packets, wherein the framer is in one of a plurality of operating states at

any given moment, and wherein the operating states include an idle state indicative of

no framing being performed and a process state indicative of framing being performed,

the operating states further include an escape state indicative of processing for an
escape byte. In an analogous art, Hwang discloses one or more Radio Link Protocol
(RLP) packets (col. 6, lines 47-49).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the one or more Radio Link Protocol
(RLP) packets, and would have applied Hwang's RLC in Shacher et al.'s deframed.
Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention, to use Hwang's radio protocol for mobile communication system and method
in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation
being to provide the RLC-ACK entity 130 (col. 6, line 47).

Furthermore, Shacher et al. in view of Hwang do not expressly disclose wherein
the framer is in one of a plurality of operating states at any given moment, and wherein
the operating states include an idle state indicative of no framing being performed and a
process state indicative of framing being performed, the operating states further include
an escape state indicative of processing for an escape byte. In an analogous art,
Aggarwal et al. disclose wherein the framer is in one of a plurality of operating states at
any given moment, and wherein the operating states include an idle state indicative of
no framing being performed and a process state indicative of framing being performed,
the operating states further include an escape state indicative of processing for an
escape byte (col. 13, lines 66-67).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the wherein the framer is in one of a
plurality of operating states at any given moment, and wherein the operating states
include an idle state indicative of no framing being performed and a process state

indicative of framing being performed, the operating states further include an escape

state indicative of processing for an escape byte, and would have applied Aggarwal et

al.'s HDLC operation in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Aggarwal et

al.'s method of and apparatus for inserting and/or deleting escape characters into and

from data packets and datagrams therefor on high speed data stream networking lines

in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation

being compared with either 7d or 7e or some programmed ACCM characters (col. 14,

lines 7-9).

4.   Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shacher

et al. (US 5,671,223) in view of Aggarwal et al. (US 6,249,525).

        For claim 6, Shacher et al. disclose multichannel HDLC framing/deframing

machine, comprising:

        an input interface unit (figure 4, reference 120) operative to receive data to be

deframed (col. 7, lines 10-11);

        a detection unit (figure 9, reference 308) operative to evaluate each data byte

from the input interface unit to detect for bytes of specific values (col. 11, line 65 to col.

12, line 1) and operative to detect for flag bytes in the received data (col. 11, line 67 to

col. 12, line 1);

        a state control unit (figure 9, reference 312) operative to provide a first set of

control signals indicative of specific tasks to be performed for deframing based in part

on the detected bytes of specific values (col. 12, lines 27-57).

Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose a conversion unit operative to deframe the received data based on the first set of control signals to provide deframed data. To include conversion unit operative to deframe the received data based on the first set of control signals to provide deframed data would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because Shacher et al. clearly teach at col. 12 lines 40-49 (see FIG.10), "The Rx Main Transfer Control circuit 312 determines whether or not the bits shifted out of the PRE register 310 are shifted into the DATA register 330... Determination whether the machine is Inframe is according to the state diagram in FIG.10. Zero deletion is triggered when Inframe and five ones are detected (FONES) by the PST detection circuit 322."

However, Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose operative to detect for and remove escape bytes in the received data, and operative to un-escape a data byte following each detected escape byte in the received data. In an analogous art, Aggarwal et al. disclose operative to detect for and remove escape bytes in the received data, and operative to un-escape a data byte following each detected escape byte in the received data (col. 13, line 66 to col. 14, line 14).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the operative to detect for and remove escape bytes in the received data, and operative to un-escape a data byte following each detected escape byte in the received data, and would have applied Aggarwal et al.'s HDLC operation in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Aggarwal et al.'s method of and apparatus for inserting and/or deleting escape

characters into and from data packets and datagrams therefor on high speed data

stream networking lines in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing

machine with the motivation being compared with either 7d or 7e or some programmed

ACCM characters (col. 14, lines 7-9).

5.   Claims 7, 17-20, 36 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Shacher et al. (US 5,671,223) in view of Aggarwal et al. (US

6,249,525) further in view of W. Simpson, RFC 1662.

For claim 7, Shacher et al. disclose multichannel HDLC framing/deframing

machine, comprising:

an input interface unit (figure 4, reference 120) operative to receive data to be

deframed (col. 7, lines 10-11);

a detection unit (figure 9, reference 308) operative to evaluate each data byte

from the input interface unit to detect for bytes of specific values (col. 11, line 65 to col.

12, line 1) and operative to detect for flag bytes in the received data (col. 11, line 67 to

col. 12, line 1);

a state control unit (figure 9, reference 312) operative to provide a first set of

control signals indicative of specific tasks to be performed for deframing based in part

on the detected bytes of specific values (col. 12, lines 27-57).

Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose a conversion unit operative to deframe

the received data based on the first set of control signals to provide deframed data. To

include conversion unit operative to deframe the received data based on the first set of

control signals to provide deframed data would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art because Shacher et al. clearly teach at col. 12, lines 40-49 (see FIG.10),

"The Rx Main Transfer Control circuit 312 determines whether or not the bits shifted out

of the PRE register 310 are shifted into the DATA register 330... Determination whether

the machine is Inframe is according to the state diagram in FIG.10. Zero deletion is

triggered when Inframe and five ones are detected (FONES) by the PST detection

circuit 322."

However, Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose operative to detect for escape

bytes in the received data; and further operative to provide a header word for each

detected flag byte in the received data. In an analogous art, Aggarwal et al. disclose

operative to detect for escape bytes in the received data; and further operative to

provide a word for each detected flag byte in the received data (col. 1, lines 43-44, and

col. 13, line 66 to col. 14, line 14).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the operative to detect for and

remove flag and escape bytes in the received data, and operative to un-escape a data

byte following each detected escape byte in the received data, and would have applied

Aggarwal et al.'s HDLC operation in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use

Aggarwal et al.'s method of and apparatus for inserting and/or deleting escape

characters into and from data packets and datagrams therefor on high speed data

stream networking lines in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing

machine with the motivation being compared with either 7d or 7e or some programmed

ACCM characters (col. 14, lines 7-9).

Furthermore, Shacher et al. in view of Aggarwal et al. do not expressly disclose operative to provide a header word for each detected flag byte in the received data. In an analogous art, W. Simpson disclose operative to provide a header word for each detected flag byte in the received data (section 3.1 Frame Format).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the operative to provide a header word for each detected flag byte in the received data, and would have applied W.Simpson's frame format in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use W. Simpson's PPP in HDLC-like Framing in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation being to provide the PPP HDLC-like frame structure (section 3.1 Frame Format).

For claim 17, Shacher et al. disclose multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine, comprising:

an input interface unit (figure 4, reference 120) operative to receive data to be deframed (col. 7, lines 10-11);

a detection unit (figure 9, reference 308) operative to evaluate each data byte from the input interface unit to detect for bytes of specific values (col. 11, line 65 to col. 12, line 1);

a state control unit (figure 9, reference 312) operative to provide a first set of control signals indicative of specific tasks to be performed for deframing based in part on the detected bytes of specific value (col. 11, line 65 to col. 12, line 1).

Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose a conversion unit operative to deframe the received data based on the first set of control signals to provide deframed data. To include conversion unit operative to deframe the received data based on the first set of control signals to provide deframed data would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because Shacher et al. clearly teach at col. 12, lines 40-49 (see FIG.10), "The Rx Main Transfer Control circuit 312 determines whether or not the bits shifted out of the PRE register 310 are shifted into the DATA register 330... Determination whether the machine is Inframe is according to the state diagram in FIG.10. Zero deletion is triggered when Inframe and five ones are detected (FONES) by the PST detection circuit 322."

However, Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose wherein the operating states include an idle state indicative of no deframing being performed and a process state indicative of deframing being performed, and wherein the operating states further include an escape state indicative of processing for an escape byte and a header state indicative of generation of a header for the deframed data. In an analogous art, Aggarwal et al. disclose wherein the operating states include an idle state indicative of no deframing being performed and a process state indicative of deframing being performed, and wherein the operating states further include an escape state indicative of processing for an escape byte (col. 1, lines 43-44, and col. 13, line 66 to col. 14, line 14).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the wherein the operating states include an idle state indicative of no deframing being performed and a process state

indicative of deframing being performed, and wherein the operating states further

include an escape state indicative of processing for an escape byte, and would have

applied Aggarwal et al.'s HDLC operation in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to

use Aggarwal et al.'s method of and apparatus for inserting and/or deleting escape

characters into and from data packets and datagrams therefor on high speed data

stream networking lines in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing

machine with the motivation being compared with either 7d or 7e or some programmed

ACCM characters (col. 14, lines 7-9).

Furthermore, Shacher et al. in view of Aggarwal et al. do not expressly disclose a

header state indicative of generation of a header for the deframed data. In an analogous

art, W. Simpson discloses a header state indicative of generation of a header for the

deframed data (section 3.1 Frame Format).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the header state indicative of

generation of a header for the deframed data, and would have applied W.Simpson's

frame format in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use W. Simpson's PPP in

HDLC-like Framing in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine

with the motivation being to provide the PPP HDLC-like frame structure (section 3.1

Frame Format).

For claim 18, Shacher et al. disclose multichannel HDLC framing/deframing

machine, comprising:

an input interface unit (figure 4, reference 120) operative to receive an RLP

packet of data to be deframed, one word at a time, and for each received word provide

one data byte at a time for subsequent processing (col. 7, lines 10-11);

a detection unit (figure 9, reference 308) operative to evaluate each data byte

from the input interface unit (col. 11, line 65 to col. 12, line 1);

a state control unit (figure 9, reference 312) operative to provide a first set of

control signals indicative of specific tasks to be performed for deframing based in part

on the detected bytes of specific values (col. 12, lines 27-57).

Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose a conversion unit operative to deframe

the received data based on the first set of control signals to process each data byte

from the interface unit. To include conversion unit operative to deframe the received

data based on the first set of control signals to process each data byte from the

interface unit would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because

Shacher et al. clearly teach at col. 12 lines 40-49 (see FIG.10), "The Rx Main Transfer

Control circuit 312 determines whether or not the bits shifted out of the PRE register

310 are shifted into the DATA register 330... Determination whether the machine is

Inframe is according to the state diagram in FIG.10. Zero deletion is triggered when

Inframe and five ones are detected (FONES) by the PST detection circuit 322."

However, Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose removing flag and escape

bytes, un-escaping a data byte following each escape byte, providing a header word for

each flag byte, and checking each deframed packet based on a flame check sequence

(FCS) value associated with the packet; and an output interface unit operative to

provide deframed data; and wherein the RLP packet includes one or more complete or partial PPP packets having a format defined by RFC1662. In an analogous art, Aggarwal et al. disclose removing flag and escape bytes, un-escaping a data byte following each escape byte, providing a word for each flag byte (col. 1, lines 43-44, and col. 13, line 66 to col. 14, line 14).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the removing flag and escape bytes, un-escaping a data byte following each escape byte, providing a word for each flag byte, and wherein the operating states further include an escape state indicative of processing for an escape byte, and would have applied Aggarwal et al.'s HDLC operation in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Aggarwal et al.'s method of and apparatus for inserting and/or deleting escape characters into and from data packets and datagrams therefor on high speed data stream networking lines in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation being compared with either 7d or 7e or some programmed ACCM characters (col. 14, lines 7-9).

Furthermore, Shacher et al. in view of Aggarwal et al. do not expressly disclose providing a header word for each flag byte, and checking each deframed packet based on a flame check sequence (FCS) value associated with the packet; and an output interface unit operative to provide deframed data; and wherein the RLP packet includes one or more complete or partial PPP packets having a format defined by RFC1662. In an analogous art, W. Simpson discloses providing a header word for each flag byte

(page 4, section 3.1 Frame Format), and checking each deframed packet based on a

flame check sequence (FCS) value associated with the packet (page 5, section 3.1

Frame Format); and an output interface unit operative to provide deframed data; and

wherein the RLP packet includes one or more complete or partial PPP packets having a

format defined by RFC1662 (See W. Simpson, RFC: 1662).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the providing a header word for

each flag byte, and would have applied W.Simpson's frame format in Shacher et al.'s

deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention, to use W. Simpson's PPP in HDLC-like Framing in Shacher et al.'s

multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation being to provide the

PPP HDLC-like frame structure (section 3.1 Frame Format).

For claim 19, Shacher et al. disclose multichannel HDLC framing/deframing

machine, comprising:

an input interface unit (figure 4, reference 120) operative to receive an RLP

packet of data to be deframed, one word at a time, and for each received word provide

one data byte at a time for subsequent processing (col. 7, lines 10-11);

a detection unit (figure 9, reference 308) operative to evaluate each data byte

from the input interface unit (col. 11, line 65 to col. 12, line 1);

a state control unit (figure 9, reference 312) operative to provide a first set of

control signals indicative of specific tasks to be performed for deframing based in part

on the detected bytes of specific values (col. 12, lines 27-57).

Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose a conversion unit operative to deframe the received data based on the first set of control signals to process each data byte from the interface unit. To include conversion unit operative to deframe the received data based on the first set of control signals to process each data byte from the interface unit would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because Shacher et al. clearly teach at col. 12 lines 40-49 (see FIG.10), "The Rx Main Transfer Control circuit 312 determines whether or not the bits shifted out of the PRE register 310 are shifted into the DATA register 330... Determination whether the machine is Inframe is according to the state diagram in FIG.10. Zero deletion is triggered when Inframe and five ones are detected (FONES) by the PST detection circuit 322."

However, Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose removing flag and escape bytes, un-escaping a data byte following each escape byte, providing a header word for each flag byte, and checking each deframed packet based on a flame check sequence (FCS) value associated with the packet; and an output interface unit operative to provide deframed data; and wherein the RLP packet includes one or more complete or partial PPP packets having a format defined by RFC1662. In an analogous art, Aggarwal et al. disclose removing flag and escape bytes, un-escaping a data byte following each escape byte, providing a word for each flag byte (col. 1, lines 43-44, and col. 13, line 66 to col. 14, line 14).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the removing flag and escape bytes, un-escaping a data byte following each escape byte, providing a word for each flag byte, and wherein the operating states further include an escape state indicative of

processing for an escape byte, and would have applied Aggarwal et al.'s HDLC

operation in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Aggarwal et al.'s method of

and apparatus for inserting and/or deleting escape characters into and from data

packets and datagrams therefor on high speed data stream networking lines in Shacher

et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation being

compared with either 7d or 7e or some programmed ACCM characters (col. 14, lines 7-

9).

Furthermore, Shacher et al. in view of Aggarwal et al. do not expressly disclose

providing a header word for each flag byte, and checking each deframed packet based

on a flame check sequence (FCS) value associated with the packet; and an output

interface unit operative to provide deframed data; and wherein the RLP packet includes

one or more complete or partial PPP packets having a format defined by RFC1662. In

an analogous art, W. Simpson discloses providing a header word for each flag byte

(page 4, section 3.1 Frame Format), and checking each deframed packet based on a

flame check sequence (FCS) value associated with the packet (page 5, section 3.1

Frame Format); and an output interface unit operative to provide deframed data; and

wherein the RLP packet includes one or more complete or partial PPP packets having a

format defined by RFC1662 (See W. Simpson, RFC: 1662).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the providing a header word for

each flag byte, and would have applied W.Simpson's frame format in Shacher et al.'s

deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention, to use W. Simpson's PPP in HDLC-like Framing in Shacher et al.'s

multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation being to provide the

PPP HDLC-like frame structure (section 3.1 Frame Format).

For claim 20, Shacher et al. disclose multichannel HDLC framing/deframing

machine, comprising:

receiving the RLP packet, one word at a time; evaluating each byte of each

received word (col. 7, lines 10-11);

providing status signals indicative of each detected flag byte (col. 11 line 65 to

col. 12, line 1).

However, Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose removing the flag and escape

bytes based on the status signals;un-escaping a data byte following each detected

escape byte; checking each PPP packet based on an FCS value associated with the

packet; and providing deframed data. In an analogous art, Aggarwal et al. disclose

removing the flag and escape bytes based on the status signals; un-escaping a data

byte following each detected escape byte (col. 1, lines 43-44, and col. 13, line 66 to col.

14, line 14).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the removing the flag and escape

bytes based on the status signals;un-escaping a data byte following each detected

escape byte, and would have applied Aggarwal et al.'s HDLC operation in Shacher et

al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention, to use Aggarwal et al.'s method of and apparatus for

inserting and/or deleting escape characters into and from data packets and datagrams

therefor on high speed data stream networking lines in Shacher et al.'s multichannel

HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation being compared with either 7d or

7e or some programmed ACCM characters (col. 14, lines 7-9).

Furthermore, Shacher et al. in view of Aggarwal et al. do not expressly disclose

checking each PPP packet based on an FCS value associated with the packet; and

providing deframed data. In an analogous art, W. Simpson discloses checking each

PPP packet based on an FCS value associated with the packet; and providing

deframed data (page 5, section 3.1 Frame Format).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the checking each PPP packet

based on an FCS value associated with the packet; and providing deframed data, and

would have applied W.Simpson's frame format in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore,

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention,

to use W. Simpson's PPP in HDLC-like Framing in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC

framing/deframing machine with the motivation being to provide the PPP HDLC-like

frame structure (section 3.1 Frame Format).

For claim 36, Shacher et al. disclose multichannel HDLC framing/deframing

machine, comprising:

an input interface unit (figure 4, reference 120) operative to receive data to be

deframed in one or more packets, one word at a time, and for each received word

provide one data byte at a time for subsequent processing (col. 7 lines 10-11);

a detection unit (figure 9, reference 308) operative to evaluate each data byte

from the input interface unit to detect for bytes of specific values (col. 11, line 65 to col.

12, line 1);

a state control unit (figure 9, reference 312) operative to provide a first set of

control signals indicative of specific tasks to be performed for deframing based in part

on the detected bytes of specific values (col. 12, lines 27-57).

Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose a conversion unit operative to deframe

the received data based on the first set of control signals and to process each data byte

from the interface unit. To include conversion unit operative to deframe the received

data based on the first set of control signals and to process each data byte from the

interface unit would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because

Shacher et al. clearly teach at col. 12, lines 40-49 (see FIG.10), "The Rx Main Transfer

Control circuit 312 determines whether or not the bits shifted out of the PRE register

310 are shifted into the DATA register 330... Determination whether the machine is

Inframe is according to the state diagram in FIG.10. Zero deletion is triggered when

Inframe and five ones are detected (FONES) by the PST detection circuit 322."

However, Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose inserting an escape byte for

each data byte to be escaped and escaping the data byte, inserting flag byte in

response to receiving a first command, and inserting an FCS value in response to

receiving a second command; and an output interface unit operative to provide framed

data having a format defined by RFC 1662. In an analogous art, Aggarwal et al.

disclose inserting an escape byte for each data byte to be escaped and escaping the

data byte, inserting flag byte in response to receiving a first command (col. 13, lines 66-

67).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the escape byte for each data byte

to be escaped and escaping the data byte, inserting flag byte in response to receiving a

first command, and would have applied Aggarwal et al.'s HDLC operation in Shacher et

al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time of the invention, to use Aggarwal et al.'s method of and apparatus for

inserting and/or deleting escape characters into and from data packets and datagrams

therefor on high speed data stream networking lines in Shacher et al.'s multichannel

HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation being compared with either 7d or

7e or some programmed ACCM characters (col. 14, lines 7-9).

Furthermore, Shacher et al. in view of Aggarwal et al. do not expressly disclose

inserting an FCS value in response to receiving a second command; and an output

interface unit operative to provide framed data having a format defined by RFC 1662. In

an analogous art, W. Simpson discloses inserting an FCS value in response to

receiving a second command; and an output interface unit operative to provide framed

data having a format defined by RFC 1662 (page 5, section 3.1 Frame Format).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the inserting an FCS value in

response to receiving a second command; and an output interface unit operative to

provide framed data having a format defined by RFC 1662, and would have applied

W.Simpson's frame format in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use W.

Simpson's PPP in HDLC-like Framing in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC
framing/deframing machine with the motivation being to provide the PPP HDLC-like
frame structure (section 3.1 Frame Format).

For claim 38, Shacher et al. disclose multichannel HDLC framing/deframing
machine, comprising:

receiving the packet, one word at a time; evaluating each byte of each received
word to detect for bytes (col. 7, lines 10-11);

providing status signals indicative of each data byte (col. 11, line 65 to col. 12,
line 1).

However, Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose inserting escape bytes for
each data byte to be escaped and escaping the data byte; inserting a flag byte in
respeonse to receiving a flag insert command; inserting an FCS value in response to
receiving an FCS insert command; and providing framed data having the format defined
by RFC 1662. In an analogous art, Aggarwal et al. disclose inserting escape bytes for
each data byte to be escaped and escaping the data byte; inserting a flag byte in
respeonse to receiving a flag insert command (col. 13 line 66 to col. 14 line 14).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the inserting escape bytes for each
data byte to be escaped and escaping the data byte; inserting a flag byte in respeonse
to receiving a flag insert command, and would have applied Aggarwal et al.'s HDLC
operation in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of
ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use Aggarwal et al.'s method of
and apparatus for inserting and/or deleting escape characters into and from data

packets and datagrams therefor on high speed data stream networking lines in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation being compared with either 7d or 7e or some programmed ACCM characters (col. 14, lines 7-9).

Furthermore, Shacher et al. in view of Aggarwal et al. do not expressly disclose inserting an FCS value in response to receiving an FCS insert command; and providing framed data having the format defined by RFC 1662. In an analogous art, W. Simpson discloses inserting an FCS value in response to receiving an FCS insert command; and providing framed data having the format defined by RFC 1662 (page 5, section 3.1 Frame Format).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the inserting an FCS value in response to receiving an FCS insert command; and providing framed data having the format defined by RFC 1662, and would have applied W.Simpson's frame format in Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to use W. Simpson's PPP in HDLC-like Framing in Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation being to provide the PPP HDLC-like frame structure (section 3.1 Frame Format).

6.   Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shacher et al. (US 5,671,223) in view of W. Simpson, RFC 1662.

For claim 15, Shacher et al. disclose multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine, comprising:

an input interface unit (figure 4, reference 120) operative to receive data to be

deframed (col. 7, lines 10-11);

a detection unit (figure 9, reference 308) operative to evaluate each data byte

from the input interface unit to detect for bytes of specific values (col. 11, line 65 to col.

12, line 1);

a state control unit (figure 9, reference 312) operative to provide a first set of

control signals indicative of specific tasks to be performed for deframing based in part

on the detected bytes of specific values (col. 12, lines 27-57).

Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose a conversion unit operative to deframe

the received data based on the first set of control signals to provide deframed data, and

operative to deframe a block of data for each deframing operation. To include a

conversion unit operative to deframe the received data based on the first set of control

signals to provide deframed data, and operative to deframe a block of data for each

deframing operation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because

Shacher et al. clearly teach at col. 12 lines 40-49 (see FIG.10), "The Rx Main Transfer

Control circuit 312 determines whether or not the bits shifted out of the PRE register

310 are shifted into the DATA register 330... Determination whether the machine is

Inframe is according to the state diagram in FIG.10. Zero deletion is triggered when

Inframe and five ones are detected (FONES) by the PST detection circuit 322."

However, Shacher et al. do not expressly disclose operative to provide a first

header for a start of the data bloc. In an analogous art, W. Simpson disclose operative

to provide a first header for a start of the data bloc (section 3.1 Frame Format).

One skilled in the art would have recognized the operative to provide a first

header for a start of the data bloc, and would have applied W.Simpson's frame format in

Shacher et al.'s deframed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention, to use W. Simpson's PPP in HDLC-like Framing in

Shacher et al.'s multichannel HDLC framing/deframing machine with the motivation

being to provide the PPP HDLC-like frame structure (section 3.1 Frame Format).

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed 10/10/07 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

The applicant argues with respect to claim 5 on page 11, third paragraph, that

there would be no reason or motivation to combine any redundant teachings of

Aggrawal to provide a functionality that would be extraneous and redundant since flag

and escape bytes were previously removed in Shacher's transfer control unit 312 and

the "received data" at the "conversion unit" would contain no such flag or escape

characters in need of being removed. In response to applicant's argument that there is

no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness

can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to

produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation

to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally

available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed.

Cir.1992). In this case, the motivation to combine Aggrawal's teaching of HDLC

operation in Shacher would be to remove flag and escape bytes in the received data.

The applicant argues with respect to claim 26 on page 13, second paragraph that

there would be no reason or motivation to combine any redundant teachings of

Aggrawal to provide a functionality that would be extraneous and redundant since flag

and escape bytes were previously removed in Shacher's transfer control unit 312 and

the "received data" at the "conversion unit" would contain no such flag or escape

characters in need of being removed. The examiner refers to the same response above

with respect to claim 5 above.

The applicant argues with respect to claim 33 on page 15, first paragraph that

there would be no reason or motivation to combine any redundant teachings of

Aggrawal to provide a functionality that would be extraneous and redundant since flag

and escape bytes were previously removed in Shacher's transfer control unit 312 and

the "received data" at the "conversion unit" would contain no such flag or escape

characters in need of being removed. The examiner refers to the same response above

with respect to claim 5 above.

The applicant argues with respect to claim 6 on page 18, second paragraph that

there would be no reason or motivation to combine any redundant teachings of

Aggrawal to provide a functionality that would be extraneous and redundant since flag

and escape bytes were previously removed in Shacher's transfer control unit 312 and

the "received data" at the "conversion unit" would contain no such flag or escape

characters in need of being removed. The examiner refers to the same response above

with respect to claim 5 above.

The applicant argues with respect to claims 7, 17, 18, 19, 36 on page 20, third

paragraph that there would be no reason or motivation to combine any redundant

teachings of Aggrawal to provide a functionality that would be extraneous and

redundant since flag and escape bytes were previously removed in Shacher's transfer

control unit 312 and the "received data" at the "conversion unit" would contain no such

flag or escape characters in need of being removed. The examiner refers to the same

response above with respect to claim 5 above.

The applicant argues with respect to claims 20, 38 on page 22, second

paragraph that there would be no reason or motivation to combine any redundant

teachings of Aggrawal to provide a functionality that would be extraneous and

redundant since flag and escape bytes were previously removed in Shacher's transfer

control unit 312 and the "received data" at the "conversion unit" would contain no such

flag or escape characters in need of being removed. The examiner refers to the same

response above with respect to claim 5 above.

The applicant argues with respect to claim 15 on page 24, first paragraph that

the Office Action has conceded that Shacher does not teach or suggest "a conversion

unit operative to deframe the received data" as claimed by Applicants and has

repeatedly attempted to introduce Aggarwal to supplement the lack of such teaching,

and the present rejection solely upon Shacher in view of W. Simpson. The examiner

disagrees. In response, the examiner refers to the Office Action on page 27 that

Shacher does not expressly disclose the conversion unit operative to deframe the received data based on the first set of control signals to provide deframe data, and operative to deframe a block of data for each deframing operation. To include this limitation, Shacher disclose the Rx main Transfer Control Circuit 312 at col. 12, lines 40-49 (see figure 10). The Aggarwal reference is not introduced into Shacher because claim 15 does not contain the limitation "remove flag and escape bytes in the received data".

Conclusion

8.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3153. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00AM-4:30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mr. Huy Vu can be reached on 571-272-3155. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TN
TN

Daniel Ryman

Daniel J. Ryman
Patent Examiner
AU 2616